

EL ALMIRANTIS ALMIRANTE

FALLING GUNS SHE FIRES CORKS AT A GORGEOUS VISITOR.

After a Full Throated Salute They Have to Send for That Little Greaser in the Galley to Find Out That His Excellency Is a Bandmaster in All His Glory.

The press cables from Santa Marta, Colombia, on Easter Sunday carried nothing whatever about an incident of international import which might have perished forever had it not been for the passengers of the United Fruit Company's steamer Almirante.

There was very little happening on the deck of the Almirante on Easter afternoon as she lay against the wharf at Santa Marta. Perhaps it may be assumed for purposes of local color that there was a half hearted patter of waves along the seaward side and that the smell of ripening bananas from an open hatch mingled with the warm, indeterminate tropical scent that came from the beach. Things are generally that way in a South American yam.

The passengers were having their after luncheon cigarettes in lazy, white linen luxury and complaining bitterly that nothing picturesque appeared to happen in these parts except by the will of the fictionists.

"Now, take that Venezuelan man-o-war over there," said one of them, designating the ship that lay peacefully at anchor a little way off, and flicking off his ash with one gesture. "She used to be George Gould's Atlanta. That's a good start."

"We might have some excitement if they tried to fire that three pounder in her box or one of those one pounders along her side," suggested another man as he closed his fingers around a tall glass.

Somebody said that this wasn't likely unless there was some saluting to be done, because the ship was there on a mission of peace.

"The Venezuelans are having a party," said he, "they are celebrating because they established their independence a hundred years ago. That's why they have the sailors and marines here."

"I'd like to see what would happen if the order was passed to salute," said the man whose tall glass had just been handed to the steward for replenishment. "I'll bet sixteen or twenty of them would drop dead from—"

He was interrupted by a maritime exclamation from the skipper, Capt. H. A. Henshaw, who had been watching the parade of natives going to or coming from church. The number of services there on Easter made it practically impossible to distinguish which way they were going. The skipper's exclamation had a certain ecclesiastical sound, but it was not the church parade that had attracted him.

Capt. Henshaw pointed to a small boat which had put off from the man-o-war and directed his passengers' attention to the person who he said was sitting in the stern sheets.

"Do they keep the stern sheets in the linen closet on one of these," began the man who had received his tall glass. But the captain was summoning the steward and if he heard he gave no sign. The passengers were at the rail looking into the boat that was being rowed in their direction. They had heard about South American uniforms, but this one stunned them into silence. It was baffling to the eyes, it was magnificent and fancy, it had cords of gold lace running from the waist to each shoulder, around the waist and up the back, frogged and crisscrossed over the line of medals upon the breast and diverging to two gleaming epaulettes. At this point the proceedings changed quite naturally from the field of fiction to the realm of the drama.

(The head steward was briskly down the deck and stands near the captain awaiting orders.)

"Captain—Mr. Oliphant, I think this is the commander coming aboard. Have the bar steward stand by and ice the wine."

"Oliphant—Aye, aye, sir! (Disappears inside and the tinkle of ice being cracked resounds the deck.)"

"Captain (To sailor, who is waiting to catch the small boat and draw her alongside)—Stand by, there!"

"Sailor—Aye, aye, sir! (He grasps the boat's side and offers a hand to the bearded person, who mounts to the skipper's side and salutes with precision and considerable flourish.)"

"Captain (Returning the salute)—My ship, my passengers, and I, sir, are honored."

"Chorus of Passengers—We are! We are!"

(The guest speaks very rapidly for several minutes in his own language.)

"Captain—Doubtless, my dear sir, doubtless, but will you come this way? (The bar steward goes past holding high a tray containing two glasses and carrying in his other hand a bucket from which protrude ice and the necks of bottles. The puzzled expression which had been upon the face of the uniformed person clears immediately and he follows the captain to the point where the steward has stopped.)"

"Captain—Your very good health! (The uniformed person sets his glass down empty and begins to speak fluently.)"

"Captain—My Spanish, I regret to say, is not what it once was. Now, if you will speak in English we can—"

"The Guest—Eet ees not possible to me."

"Captain (To bar steward)—Stand by with a salute of twelve bottles, and go and get that little greaser in the galley. I can't find out what he wants."

"First Passenger (in an aside)—I hope we haven't offended the Admiral, he might."

"Second Passenger (waving the tall glass)—Huzza! (A Venezuelan salute.)"

"First Passenger—The skipper seems to be getting along all right with him."

"Second Passenger—Why talk of war in times of peace?"

"Third Passenger—Approaches, leading a young native who wipes his hands on his apron."

"Captain—Find out what this man is saying. (The one in the uniform talks with complete equipment of gestures for several minutes. The interpreter questions him once or twice and then turns and says something to the skipper. Confusion, murmurs within and without. The small boat is brought alongside and the stranger departs.)"

"It was not until the Almirante was sending her nose into the swell at the entrance of Santa Marta harbor that some of the passengers summoned enough courage to approach the captain and ask him to clear up the mystery. The rise and fall of the deck had in a measure restored him to a normal state of mind."

"Why was it," asked the boldest, "that the ceremony terminated so suddenly? Wasn't he the Admiral?"

"Yes, he was the commander, the ranking officer of that ship, all right," said Capt. Henshaw.

"Then why the excitement?"

"Well, he was also the band master of that ship and his mission was to find out whether or not the music of his musicians and orchestra would be the same as that of the band over the wake of the ship the lights of Santa Marta blinked. The shore breeze that followed the Almirante brought some of the warm, indeterminate, tropical scent of the beach. It brought the faint strains of a band playing on the deck of a Venezuelan man-o-war."

"The Almirante is serving his country," said the skipper.

ASKED FOR MRS. BELMONT.

Then He Did Ascending Battle in the Plaza Hotel.

Joseph Burke, an ironworker, 30 years old, raised a rumpus in the Plaza Hotel yesterday when his request to be shown up to the room of Mrs. Belmont was refused. There is no guest of that name in the hotel.

Burke went in through the hotel entrance on Fifty-ninth street and going up to the clerk's desk said:

"I want to see Mrs. Belmont."

"The only such guest here," responded the clerk as he surveyed the visitor.

"She's here and I must see her. Show me up to her room," went on the man.

The clerk touched an electric button which brought Elliott Lane, the house detective; Peter Lyon, the taxicab driver; and Thomas Clifford, a porter. The three conveyed the visitor to the Fifty-ninth street sidewalk. He only grinned and walked around into Fifth avenue.

Coming to the hotel entrance he went in and headed rapidly up the stairs. The men that had ejected him saw him re-enter. They hastened after him and had nearly caught him on the second floor when he jumped through an open window to the roof of an adjacent building on the Fifth-ninth street side of the hotel. Some of the guests were considerably excited.

Gibney went up the stairs until he came to the seventh floor. The ironworker shook off the policeman and other three all at once. The policeman then got out his nightstick and used it on the man's head. This subdued him and he was arrested.

"Are you any relation to Mrs. Belmont?" Magistrate Hermann asked the fellow in the Yorkville police court.

"Yes, she's my wife," the prisoner replied.

"When were you married?"

"This morning on the street."

"The Magistrate committed him to Bellevue Hospital for observation as to his sanity."

FLAGS AT G. A. R. FUNERALS.

Catholic Church Sanctions Their Use and Ends a Controversy.

Post Commander James A. Rooney of McPherson-Duane Post, G. A. R., of Brooklyn, has received from the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome a decision sanctioning the draping of the American flag over the coffin of a veteran in the Roman Catholic Church. This decision will at once be spread throughout the United States. It ends friction between the Grand Army men and Church authorities.

Flags were not allowed to be used at the funeral of a Catholic veteran from Rankin Post, G. A. R., at the Church of the Presentation, Rockaway and St. Marks avenue, a short time ago. The case was referred through Post Commander Rooney, acting with Post Commander Gibbons, of Manhattan, to the Church authorities, and a letter drafted by Mr. Rooney was forwarded to Mr. Diomedeo Falconio, the apostolic delegate in Washington.

In this letter it was explained that the flag had been ordered removed from the coffin in the vestibule of the church. Many non-Catholic veterans had wondered. It was also observed that some parishes the flag was allowed to remain draped over the coffin, suggesting that the matter was one of the pastor's own judgment and not a general ruling. It was requested that a rule be established allowing the use of the flag.

Cardinal Gibbons and other Catholic clergymen wrote in reply on the request the apostolic delegate, who yesterday referred to Post Commander Rooney the favorable decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office that in so far as there was no disrespect to the church or the sacred liturgy there would be no objection.

The permission extends to use of the flag during religious ceremonies as well as in funerals, which was also requested.

LAWYER STAYS IN THE TOMBS.

Justice Blanchard Reminds on Knowing More Law Than the Court.

Charles H. Stoddard, the lawyer who was sent to the Tombs for five days and fined \$250 last Wednesday by City Court Justice McAvoy for criminal contempt of court, because he "took to his heels" when ordered to be sworn in supplementary proceedings, was before Supreme Court Justice Blanchard yesterday on habeas corpus. He wants to have the fine and imprisonment set aside on the ground that he was not guilty of contempt of court for merely refusing to obey a judge's order. The prison term ends today.

"I desire an adjournment," said Stoddard in arguing his own case, "because I did not have the facilities where I have been staying to prepare my argument, but I desire to be paroled in the custody of my counsel."

"I don't believe I can grant that request, but you may have all the time you wish to prepare your case," said the court.

"Your adjournment will be over to-morrow, and you can have all the rest of Sunday and Monday to move about freely in making your preparations. I will hear argument on Tuesday."

Justice Blanchard then suggested that Stoddard had got into trouble by thinking that he knew more about the law than the judge did.

"When I was a young lawyer," said the court, "I used to have the opinion occasionally that the judge was wrong, but I always deemed it wise to do as the court directed."

DEED HELD TO BE A FORGERY

EAST OF WOMAN'S MANY ATTEMPTS ON THE CONLON ESTATE

She Established Herself as the Widow and Secured Deed and Then Sought in Various Proceedings to Get the Rest—Deceased Testimony Disbelieved.

A suit before Supreme Court Justice Erlanger in which Mrs. Eva K. Conlon tried to have herself declared the owner of property in Worth street worth \$50,000 by virtue of an alleged deed from John P. Conlon, who has been declared the husband of Mrs. Conlon in previous court proceedings, resulted yesterday in a decision against Mrs. Conlon in which the court held that the instrument was a forgery. The case followed about twenty years of prior litigation by Mrs. Conlon, in which she finally had herself declared entitled to the deed, and the property covered by the alleged deed was all that remained of the estate after settlement had been made with Mrs. Conlon for her dower rights.

Conlon died in San José, Cal., in 1880, leaving a will executed in 1877. The bulk of the estate was given to various charities and Conlon's heirs contested it on the ground that it was in contravention of the laws of the State. Conlon was supposed to have died unmarried, but one of the contestants was Mrs. Eva K. Conlon. The will was upset and the Conlon heirs made little opposition to Mrs. Conlon's claim as the widow.

Then she had her dower annulled. Justice Erlanger says that after Mrs. Conlon brought her suit for a dower interest the court was satisfied that she had become the wife of Conlon by the rules of common law. Later the heirs had themselves declared entitled to half the estate and Mrs. Conlon appealed. Before the action was terminated Mrs. Conlon began an action for the entire estate for alleged advances to Conlon and for services under an oral contract that he would give her all his property at his death.

Mrs. Conlon's suit was dismissed, but while her appeal was pending she obtained a new trial on the ground of newly discovered evidence. On the trial before Justice O'Gorman three papers were introduced. One was a receipt reading: "Received from E. Kinnis (the name by which Mrs. Conlon was known) \$4,500 in lieu for all my estate." Another read: "For love and care I agree to make Kinnis my heir."

The third paper said: "This day I agree and contract with E. Kinnis to give her all my property, real and personal." All three were alleged to have been signed by Conlon. In behalf of Mrs. Conlon it was stated that after her personal search for evidence had proved fruitless a friend discovered the missing papers in a handbag. In his opinion in this case Justice O'Gorman said:

"I am convinced that the alleged agreement was never made and that the story of the alleged payment of \$4,500 by the plaintiff is a pure fabrication. The whole narrative is too preposterous to merit serious consideration. The genuineness of the three papers said to have been written by the deceased is open to grave suspicion, but even if genuine they were never delivered, and by themselves are of slight consequence. They cannot affect my judgment that this is a base and unscrupulous attempt to subvert a last will and testament and to plunder the estate of a pretended contract which I am satisfied never had an existence."

Justice O'Gorman's judgment dismissing the complaint was affirmed, but on March 30, 1907, there was filed in the Register's office an alleged deed to the Worth street property from Conlon to his wife, and it was to cancel this deed and declare it a forgery that the present suit was brought by Mrs. Conlon.

The testimony showed that three days before the deed was filed an advertisement appeared in a newspaper asking for information of John P. Conlon, a lawyer, Frederick G. Anderson, a lawyer, and a man who died ten days before the trial began, but whose testimony was taken on his deathbed, said he had instructed one Merrill to insert the advertisement.

He said that a broker brought Conlon to his office and that on May 14, 1887, he saw Conlon sign the deed in question. He said that Conlon put the deed in an envelope and wrote across the face: "Eva Kinnis Conlon, to be delivered only in case of my death." He said that Conlon left the envelope with him and he put it in a pigeonhole. He never saw Conlon again and forgot about the paper, but in 1907, when he was moving his office, he came across the envelope and told Merrill to insert the advertisement.

It was answered by one Campbell, an attorney, that the advertisement was inserted by him, and he gave a receipt for them. Mrs. Conlon came into the possession of the paper at once and had it recorded.

The court says that Mrs. Conlon apparently doubted the genuineness of the deed, because she consulted David N. Carvalho and William J. Kinsley, handwriting experts, and furnished them with standards of her husband's handwriting. Both pronounced the paper a forgery. Her purpose was not to impeach the deed, but to sustain its genuineness if it was called upon to prove it. Justice Erlanger says, she got Carvalho to go over the papers a second time, but he came to the same conclusion.

Justice Erlanger remarks that Mrs. Conlon was unduly biased by the adverse opinions then obtained, and maintained that the deed was genuine, relying upon the testimony of Anderson. The court says that Anderson's name was involved in other transactions. He was indicted in October, 1887, for forgery after the deed had been declared a forgery by the experts, for certifying that a certain deed was executed before him by John P. Conlon, who he never saw.

Appley, Anderson became a witness against the forger, who was convicted and sentenced to seven years in Sing Sing.

The court says that the testimony brought out other cases of like nature in

DEED HELD TO BE A FORGERY

EAST OF WOMAN'S MANY ATTEMPTS ON THE CONLON ESTATE

She Established Herself as the Widow and Secured Deed and Then Sought in Various Proceedings to Get the Rest—Deceased Testimony Disbelieved.

A suit before Supreme Court Justice Erlanger in which Mrs. Eva K. Conlon tried to have herself declared the owner of property in Worth street worth \$50,000 by virtue of an alleged deed from John P. Conlon, who has been declared the husband of Mrs. Conlon in previous court proceedings, resulted yesterday in a decision against Mrs. Conlon in which the court held that the instrument was a forgery. The case followed about twenty years of prior litigation by Mrs. Conlon, in which she finally had herself declared entitled to the deed, and the property covered by the alleged deed was all that remained of the estate after settlement had been made with Mrs. Conlon for her dower rights.

Conlon died in San José, Cal., in 1880, leaving a will executed in 1877. The bulk of the estate was given to various charities and Conlon's heirs contested it on the ground that it was in contravention of the laws of the State. Conlon was supposed to have died unmarried, but one of the contestants was Mrs. Eva K. Conlon. The will was upset and the Conlon heirs made little opposition to Mrs. Conlon's claim as the widow.

Then she had her dower annulled. Justice Erlanger says that after Mrs. Conlon brought her suit for a dower interest the court was satisfied that she had become the wife of Conlon by the rules of common law. Later the heirs had themselves declared entitled to half the estate and Mrs. Conlon appealed. Before the action was terminated Mrs. Conlon began an action for the entire estate for alleged advances to Conlon and for services under an oral contract that he would give her all his property at his death.

Mrs. Conlon's suit was dismissed, but while her appeal was pending she obtained a new trial on the ground of newly discovered evidence. On the trial before Justice O'Gorman three papers were introduced. One was a receipt reading: "Received from E. Kinnis (the name by which Mrs. Conlon was known) \$4,500 in lieu for all my estate." Another read: "For love and care I agree to make Kinnis my heir."

The third paper said: "This day I agree and contract with E. Kinnis to give her all my property, real and personal." All three were alleged to have been signed by Conlon. In behalf of Mrs. Conlon it was stated that after her personal search for evidence had proved fruitless a friend discovered the missing papers in a handbag. In his opinion in this case Justice O'Gorman said:

"I am convinced that the alleged agreement was never made and that the story of the alleged payment of \$4,500 by the plaintiff is a pure fabrication. The whole narrative is too preposterous to merit serious consideration. The genuineness of the three papers said to have been written by the deceased is open to grave suspicion, but even if genuine they were never delivered, and by themselves are of slight consequence. They cannot affect my judgment that this is a base and unscrupulous attempt to subvert a last will and testament and to plunder the estate of a pretended contract which I am satisfied never had an existence."

Justice O'Gorman's judgment dismissing the complaint was affirmed, but on March 30, 1907, there was filed in the Register's office an alleged deed to the Worth street property from Conlon to his wife, and it was to cancel this deed and declare it a forgery that the present suit was brought by Mrs. Conlon.

The testimony showed that three days before the deed was filed an advertisement appeared in a newspaper asking for information of John P. Conlon, a lawyer, Frederick G. Anderson, a lawyer, and a man who died ten days before the trial began, but whose testimony was taken on his deathbed, said he had instructed one Merrill to insert the advertisement.

He said that a broker brought Conlon to his office and that on May 14, 1887, he saw Conlon sign the deed in question. He said that Conlon put the deed in an envelope and wrote across the face: "Eva Kinnis Conlon, to be delivered only in case of my death." He said that Conlon left the envelope with him and he put it in a pigeonhole. He never saw Conlon again and forgot about the paper, but in 1907, when he was moving his office, he came across the envelope and told Merrill to insert the advertisement.

It was answered by one Campbell, an attorney, that the advertisement was inserted by him, and he gave a receipt for them. Mrs. Conlon came into the possession of the paper at once and had it recorded.

The court says that Mrs. Conlon apparently doubted the genuineness of the deed, because she consulted David N. Carvalho and William J. Kinsley, handwriting experts, and furnished them with standards of her husband's handwriting. Both pronounced the paper a forgery. Her purpose was not to impeach the deed, but to sustain its genuineness if it was called upon to prove it. Justice Erlanger says, she got Carvalho to go over the papers a second time, but he came to the same conclusion.

Justice Erlanger remarks that Mrs. Conlon was unduly biased by the adverse opinions then obtained, and maintained that the deed was genuine, relying upon the testimony of Anderson. The court says that Anderson's name was involved in other transactions. He was indicted in October, 1887, for forgery after the deed had been declared a forgery by the experts, for certifying that a certain deed was executed before him by John P. Conlon, who he never saw.

Appley, Anderson became a witness against the forger, who was convicted and sentenced to seven years in Sing Sing.

The court says that the testimony brought out other cases of like nature in

REVISION OF THE DECALOGUE.

Bishop Greer Says No Change in Spirit Is in Question—Only in Form.

Bishop Greer in commenting yesterday on the suggestion of Canon Douglas of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine that the wording of the Decalogue be revised said that the proposal should not be construed as meaning that the Episcopal Church is ready to countenance a weakening of the moral code. Dr. Douglas made his suggestion on Friday before the congress of the Episcopal Church at Washington. He argued that the earlier form was simpler than that now used in most of the Protestant churches, and that a reversion to the old wording would increase the force of the Decalogue.

The Bishop said that the discussion was essentially literary, having to do solely with the form in which the Ten Commandments should be presented.

"There seems to be some danger all over the country," said he, "that persons will make the mistake of supposing that it is intended to alter the spirit of the Commandments. The Decalogue in the minds of worshippers often stands as the symbol of the moral code. I fear that the impression will be spread that the Church intends to alter the moral code."

There is no intention of altering the spirit of the Commandments. No one has any idea of changing the Decalogue. The only change suggested is the shortening of several Commandments to their original form by dropping certain additions which had crept in long before the English prayer book was compiled.

The Bishop said he had not made up his mind about the proposed changes. Many persons, he said, would prefer to keep the Decalogue in its familiar form, and others would be glad of the simplicity of the briefer version.

"It is not a live or a lively issue," said the Bishop, "and it is not likely to be. The purpose is to make it more easily taken at least five years to accomplish it. Such a change would have to be agreed to by the legislative council of the church, and the next council, there will be no meeting of the legislative council until 1913, and the one which is held next after that is not likely to see the change is no expectation of an immediate change in the prayer book version of the Ten Commandments."

TIRES OF LIFE SAVER SPOUSE.

Hettess Who Elope Last Fall Wants Her Name Made O'Brien Again.

St. Louis, April 29.—Helen O'Brien Howland filed suit to-day to divorce John Arthur Howland, the Spring Lake, N. J., life saver with whom she eloped on August 26, 1910, while spending the summer at the seashore. She denies that her affections had been so seriously injured by the fact that her husband's bad morals caused her great humiliation.

Mrs. Howland, who was Helen O'Brien, says she never knew her husband until she met him at the seashore. She alleges that he failed to provide for her and after their marriage asked for money with which to begin business.

Shortly after her marriage Mrs. Howland received \$10,000 from the Federal Court, which was an inheritance from her father, the late John O'Brien, a rich boiler maker.

Mrs. Howland says that after her marriage she learned that Howland was charged with a crime in Philadelphia. The allegation refers to Howland's escapades with a lawyer's stenographer in that city. Later her apology to the Catholic Church here for her elopement, signed with her maiden name only, was read out by the priest to whom she confessed.

GOV. PENNEWILL'S FINE HIT.

Helped Open Ball Season at Wilmington With Mayor Spruance.

Wilmington, Del., April 29.—The baseball season opened auspiciously here to-day. At the opening game of the Inter-city League between the Du Pont and Wilmington Gas Company's club of this city Gov. Pennewill and Mayor Spruance of Wilmington were present. The Governor, formerly a noted pitcher, batted out fine and practiced pitching to the delight of the 2,000 fans present. He lifted a ball over right field fence and the outfielders were bound.

The Mayor, who is president of the league and a former player, also practiced. He threw the first ball in the game, and the executives took off their coats and practiced with both teams like veterans. The Governor told the managers of the respective clubs that he wished he "was out there," meaning in the field. Du Pont won 2 to 1.

The Governor was some years ago the best pitcher in Delaware. He had an offer from the Philadelphia Nationals, but his father would not let him play professionally.

"He drew another Sirdar from his case."

("Fighting Chance," Page 139—Robert W. Chambers)

Vantine's Sirdar Cigarettes

For years the Vantine Cigarettes have been chosen by discriminating smokers, and have been used by the exclusive clubs.

Our special blend of pure Turkish tobaccos. We ask you to try them. 25c. for ten. \$2.25 for box of one hundred. Ladies' size, 20c. for ten; one hundred, \$1.85. Mail orders filled.

Sold in our Conditment Department (main floor), where you may also find many most unusual table delicacies. Nuts, confections, sauces, fruits—from far countries and encased in queer packages.

Vantine's
The Oriental Store.

Also Oriental Perfumes, Japanese Fans, Carved Ivories, Oriental Rugs, Japanese Screens, Oriental Draperies and Wall Fabrics, Dress Silks

Broadway, bet. 18th and 19th Sts., New York.

Also Boston and Philadelphia.

which Anderson had been involved in, one of which he took an acknowledgment six months after the death of the supposed grantor, and the court adds:

"The conviction is forced upon me that Anderson was a pliant tool for some person who made forgery his business, and when the emergency called for his aid he readily took the acknowledgment to such deeds."

Justice Erlanger also noted that two witnesses testified that when Anderson was in prison on the Appleby charge "he admitted to at least two persons that the deed which was the subject of this case was a 'crooked one.'"

Anderson denied this in his deposition, but the court says there is no reason why the witnesses should be discredited.

The court remarked that Conlon's signature was easy to forge because the standards submitted showed many different styles, and that while the signature to the deed in the subject of this case was a "crooked one," the proof, inferences and circumstances convinced to a moral certainty that the deed is a forgery.

REVISION OF THE DECALOGUE.

Bishop Greer Says No Change in Spirit Is in Question—Only in Form.

Bishop Greer in commenting yesterday on the suggestion of Canon Douglas of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine that the wording of the Decalogue be revised said that the proposal should not be construed as meaning that the Episcopal Church is ready to countenance a weakening of the moral code. Dr. Douglas made his suggestion on Friday before the congress of the Episcopal Church at Washington. He argued that the earlier form was simpler than that now used in most of the Protestant churches, and that a reversion to the old wording would increase the force of the Decalogue.

The Bishop said that the discussion was essentially literary, having to do solely with the form in which the Ten Commandments should be presented.

"There seems to be some danger all over the country," said he, "that persons will make the mistake of supposing that it is intended to alter the spirit of the Commandments. The Decalogue in the minds of worshippers often stands as the symbol of the moral code. I fear that the impression will be spread that the Church intends to alter the moral code."

There is no intention of altering the spirit of the Commandments. No one has any idea of changing the Decalogue. The only change suggested is the shortening of several Commandments to their original form by dropping certain additions which had crept in long before the English prayer book was compiled.

The Bishop said he had not made up his mind about the proposed changes. Many persons, he said, would prefer to keep the Decalogue in its familiar form, and others would be glad of the simplicity of the briefer version.

"It is not a live or a lively issue," said the Bishop, "and it is not likely to be. The purpose is to make it more easily taken at least five years to accomplish it. Such a change would have to be agreed to by the legislative council of the church, and the next council, there will be no meeting of the legislative council until 1913, and the one which is held next after that is not likely to see the change is no expectation of an immediate change in the prayer book version of the Ten Commandments."

TIRES OF LIFE SAVER SPOUSE.

Hettess Who Elope Last Fall Wants Her Name Made O'Brien Again.

St. Louis, April 29.—Helen O'Brien Howland filed suit to-day to divorce John Arthur Howland, the Spring Lake, N. J., life saver with whom she eloped on August 26, 1910, while spending the summer at the seashore. She denies that her affections had been so seriously injured by the fact that her husband's bad morals caused her great humiliation.

Mrs. Howland, who